

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance based on the below comments are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuguchi, et al. (USP 6,310,885) in view of Canada, et al. (USP 6,301,514) and claims 3-5, 7, 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizuguchi, Canada and Basani (USP 6,718,361). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant's remarks with respect to Mizuguchi and Basani in the previous Office Action dated May 2, 2005 are hereby incorporated by reference.

In embodiments of the present invention, the plurality of nodes are configured in a communication system. The master node among a plurality of nodes is designated based on the transmission qualities amongst the nodes.

The Office Action states that Mizuguchi "does not explicitly teach based on transmission qualities." See page 3 of the Office Action. The Office Action provides Canada to teach this feature absent in Mizuguchi and refers to column 13, lines 35-45 and column 16, lines 18-49 as providing this feature of the embodiments of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's allegations. Canada teaches a method and system of configuring and synchronizing a wireless machine monitoring system. In Canada's system, a command station (6) controls the commands and information sent to machine monitors (4) via repeaters (8). Thus, the command station controls the operation of the system.

The repeaters are used to propagate the signals received from the command station. The repeaters receive and rebroadcast the command station signals so that the machine monitors receive the signals. A repeater is not always necessary depending on the proximity of the machine monitors to the command station. See column 6, line 49 though column 7, line 19.

In Canada, there is no selection of a master node from among a plurality of nodes. A command station controls the operation of the machine monitors. Column 13, lines 35-45 and column 16, lines 18-49 merely discuss determining the transmission signal strength levels of a machine monitor and the command station. If the signal strength falls below a certain level, then a repeater is necessary and installed in order to allow the machine monitor and the command station to communicate with each other. The command station continually monitors the signal strength of various repeaters and machine monitors in the system to mitigate problems caused by lack of signal strength. The detection of signal strength in Canada, does not determine a master node from among a plurality of nodes.

Therefore, Canada fails to teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a designation step of designating one of said nodes as a master node based on transmission qualities among the nodes, designating other nodes a slave nodes, as recited in claim 1;

designating a node as a master node based on transmission qualities between nodes, designating other nodes as slave nodes, as recited in claim 3;

one master node selective from among said nodes based on transmission qualities among said nodes, as recited in claim 8;

a master designation step of designating a node that becomes best in transmission quality between said node and other nodes, from among all nodes, as a master node, as recited in claim 7;

if its own node is designated as a master node logically star-connected to other nodes and if there exists such a node that would become best in transmission quality when logical star connections with other the nodes were conducted in response to connection of a new node or a change of a communication state, then said processing unit conducts processing of ordering alteration of said node to a master node and transferring communication parameters among all nodes currently held to a master node after alternation, as recited in claim 10; and

the master node that is selected from among all nodes and that is best in transmission quality with respect to other nodes, as recited in claim 12.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Mizuguchi and Canada fail to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 8. Also, the combination of Mizuguchi, Canada and Basani fails to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 3, 7, 10 and 12, as required. Thus, independent claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10 and 12 are distinguishable over the cited references. Dependent claims 2, 4-6, 9 and 11 are also distinguishable for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-12 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Chad J. Billings, Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 26, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____


Michael R. Cammarata
Registration No.: 39,491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Rd
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant